

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated January 9, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 20-37 are all the claims pending in the application. With this Amendment, claims 20-28 and 30-37 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Applicants have herein amended the abstract. The changes to the abstract include minor editorial and clarifying changes. A replacement abstract showing a marked-up version of the abstract is also included. No new matter has been added by the changes made to the abstract.

In the Office Action, claims 35 and 36 have been objected to because of minor typographical errors. The Applicants have amended claims 35 and 36 to correct the typographical errors noted by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 35 and 36 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 20, 21, 24, 29, 31, 32, 35 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Deshpande et al. (A Real-Time Interactive Virtual Classroom Multimedia Distance Learning System, IEEE Transactions On Multimedia, Vol. 3, No. 4, December 2001, hereafter "Deshpande").

The Applicants have amended independent claims 20, 31, 35 and 36 to help further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. As amended, claim 31 recites (in relevant part) the following features that are not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art:

“An information processing device capable of sharing an image with other information processing devices belonging to a same main group as that of the information processing device, the information processing device comprising:...

a control section operable to execute interactive image viewing of the image to be shared based on shared information received by said reception section, the image to be shared being specified by the server in accordance with an operation performed by an information processing device belonging to the same main group, wherein the image is shared only between the

information processing device and at least one other information processing devices in the same main group that are also arranged in a sub group, and

the control section is also operable to execute interactive image viewing of the image to be shared based on shared image information received by said reception section, wherein the image is shared within the entire main group with all the information processing devices belonging to the same main group.”

The features of claim 20 noted above are similarly recited in independent claims 31, 35 and 36. Specifically, independent claim 31 is an information processing system that includes a control section having similar features of the control section of claim 20. Independent claim 35 is an information processing method including determining, displaying and executing steps directed to similar features of the control section of claim 20. And, independent claim 36 is a program for performing an information processing method including determining, displaying and executing steps directed to similar features of the control section of claim 20. Support for the features noted above are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure (see e.g., paragraphs [0017]-[0041]).

As amended, independent claims 20, 31, 35 and 36 more particularly point out that the information processing device, system, method and program of present invention are operable to execute interactive image viewing of a shared image among information processing devices in the same main group that are also arranged as a sub group. In other words, using shared image information for the sub group and the main group, the information processing device, system, method and program of present invention are able to differentiate between executing interactive viewing of a shared image only within a sub group of image processing devices and within a main group of all image processing devices. No such feature is believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Deshpande for disclosing or suggesting all the features of independent claims 20, 31, 35 and 36. Specifically, the Examiner relied on Fig. 4, and pg. 434 and pg. 435 of Deshpande for disclosing all the features of the claimed control section.

However, Desphande in Fig. 4 illustrates a typical classroom session that includes the use of a live class server (LCS) that is accessed by remote participants. In the live classroom session of Desphande, each remote participant passively receives a live class broadcast and can actively ask questions in real-time using the LCS server. After the questions are asked, an instructor can also answer the questions asked by the remote participant.

Therefore, Fig. 4 of Deshpande only describes interactions between an instructor and a remote participant. Nothing in Fig. 4 (or the related description) discloses or suggests different groups participating in interactive viewing of a shared image, let alone differentiating between executing interactive viewing of a shared image only in sub group and executing interactive viewing of a shared image in a main group.

Additionally, Desphande at pg. 434 through pg. 435 merely describes the use of an electronic slide presentation that can be used in a live classroom session. Although it appears that the electronic slides are interactive with regard to the instructor and the remote participant, there is, again, no mention of different groups participating in interacting viewing with a shared image, let alone differentiating between executing interactive viewing of a shared image only in sub group and executing interactive viewing of a shared image in a main group.

Accordingly, Desphande fails to disclose or suggest at least the following features recited similarly in claims 20 and 31:

“a control section operable to execute interactive image viewing of the image to be shared based on shared information received by said reception section, the image to be shared being specified by the server in accordance with an operation performed by an information processing device belonging to the same main group, wherein the image is shared only between the information processing device and at least one other information processing devices in the same main group that are also arranged in a sub group, and

the control section is also operable to execute interactive image viewing of the image to be shared based on shared image information received by said reception section, wherein the image is shared within the entire main group with all the information processing devices belonging to the same main group.”

Moreover, Deshpande also fails to disclose or suggest at least the following features recited similarly in claims 35 and 36:

“determining whether or not the image to be shared, which is indicated by the shared image information received, is to be shared only between the information processing device and at least one other information processing device in a main group that are also arranged in a sub group”; and

“displaying the image by using the shared information when it is determined that the image is to be shared only within the sub group, and executing interactive image viewing only for the information processing device and the at least one other information processing device that are arranged as a sub group, and when it is determined that the image is to be shared within the same main group, displaying the image by using the shared image information, and executing interactive viewing for all information processing devices belonging to the same main group.”

Based on the above discussion, independent claims 20, 31, 35 and 36 (as amended) are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Deshpande. Likewise, claims 21, 24, 29 and 32 are also not anticipated or rendered obvious by Deshpande based on their respective dependency from independent claims 20 and 31.

In the Office Action, claims 22, 23, 26-28, 30, 33, 34 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deshpande in view of the Handbook for the Palm™ Tungsten™ T3 Handheld (1998-2003 Palm, Inc., hereafter “Tungsten T3”), and further in view of PalmOne Tungsten Update (hereafter “Tungsten Update”).

Claims 22, 23, 26, 28 and 30 depend from independent claim 20; and claims 33, 34 and 37 depend from independent claim 31. As noted above, Deshpande fails to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claims 20 and 31, as amended. Additionally, neither Tungsten T3 nor Tungsten Update appears to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Deshpande. Accordingly, no combination of Deshpande, Tungsten T3 and Tungsten Update would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 22, 23, 26, 28, 30, 33, 34 and 37 based on their respective dependency from independent claims 20 and 31.

In the Office Action, claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Deshpande in view of Waites (U.S. Patent No. 6788,769, hereafter "Waites").

Claim 25 depends from independent claim 20. As noted above, Deshpande fails to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claim 20, as amended. Accordingly, no combination of Deshpande and Waites would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claim 25 based on its dependency from independent claim 20.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action dated January 9, 2008, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Noriko SUGIMOTO et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2008.04.09 18:13:08 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP/DMO/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 9, 2008